



Teaching Staff Disposition on the Operational Practices of Satellite Public Campuses

Marjielou C. Abinsay

Abstract

This descriptive research assessed the current operational practices of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines Laguna Satellite Campuses. Specifically, it assessed the administration, instruction, research, extension, and local government unit (LGU) assistance of the University. Based from the disposition of the 112 teaching staff from the four (4) satellite campuses, the operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses were generally “very satisfactory” in all the variables tested. When grouped according to the respondents’ demographic profile, there was no statistical difference in the assessment of the respondents. With these findings, the researcher recommends that the administrators should take consideration in giving cash gifts, tokens or incentives, involvements of the faculty in research and extension activities of the university, full support in funding of projects, training, seminar and students activities of the LGU are highly recommended. Further research can be conducted that will enliven the continuity and further development of the study on hand. Furthermore, similar study with larger number of population and wider locale can be considered.

Keywords: *operational practices, administration, higher education, PUP*

Received: July 3, 2021

Revised: September 6, 2021

Accepted: September 10, 2021

Suggested Citation: Abinsay, M.C. (2021). Teaching Staff Disposition on the Operational Practices of Satellite Public Campuses. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, Volume 2 Issue 3, pp. 18 - 38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53378/348734>

About the author:

Administrative Assistant I, Office of the Director and part-time instructor of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines Calauan Campus.



© The author (s). Published by Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated.

This is an open-access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Read full license details here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

1. Introduction

Education plays a key role in the development of any country in which educational reforms have been tied to economic development in the context of the Philippines. Philippine educational reforms have been shaped not only by its growing population, but also by its response to the dynamic global demand for talent (Suarez, et.al. 2018). One of the most pressing problem in the Philippines is the quality and cost of the tertiary education. In the public colleges and universities, this can be attributed to the shortage in resources of the government, uncontrollable increases in tuition fees, and increasing speed in the population of the students (Epoc, 2010). However, the Philippine government aims to improve the quality of education and increase student participation and access (Matcha et. al., 2018). The Republic Act 10931 also known as Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education Act provides access to free education by providing state colleges and universities (SUCs) that offer no tuition and other fees. This act helps increase enrollment but greatly impacts on the public budget and struggle on social benefits (Matcha et. al., 2018). Through this, students from low-income households can have equal opportunity for higher education.

One of the leading university in the country that offers free and accessible education is the Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP). It currently has 22 satellite branches and campuses across Central Luzon, Southern Luzon, and Metro Manila. Mandated by Presidential Decree No. 1341, the University has the authority to expand diametrically through the establishments of branches that can provide inclusive and equitable quality education to the students from different provinces. PUP branches and campuses differ in terms of funding and characteristics. The branch is supported or funded by the national government with number of support personnel while a campus is budgeted by the LGU with limited resources. The first PUP campus in Laguna was established in San Pedro on 2002. With so much demand for higher education in this province, PUP established three more campuses in Sta. Rosa on 2003, Biñan, and Calauan on 2009. These campuses were instituted by the PUP and LGU Memorandum of Agreement.

The areas of concerns in the operation of the campus are teaching staffs trained to deliver courses, access to ICT facilities and software, and teaching and learning materials. Since all the PUP Laguna Campuses are funded by the LGU, an internal assessment is necessary to identify the strengths, weaknesses and operational good practices. With the current track record of the

PUP in terms of teaching and learning, research and extension services, the campuses are expected to be at par with its standards. Moreover, the assistance and funds provided by the LGUs are important variables for the efficacy of its operations. Thus this study assessed the operation of the PUP Laguna satellite campuses in terms of administration, instruction, research, extension, and LGU assistance.

2. Literature review

2.1. Operation of HEIs

As defined in an article of Quality Management (2020), operations refer to the practices that are common and quality assurance processes of the institutions. It helps as a support in the University community in its work and in the placement of the new workforces, helps in the operation growth in terms of black and white transactions, and assists the different practices that suit different parts of the institution. It also describes how management systematically works as well as its main duties. According to Heizer & Render (2014), operation management is a transformation of the inputs into outputs in the form of products and services that can be found in the different set of activities. The management of the operation sustains the mission and strategy implementation that can help the institutions design product and services. According to the American Management Association (2007), to reach the philosophy and beliefs of the organization, it must maintain its high performance and consistency of the strategies. Commonly, organizations with high performance have strong management and human resource values that are in place (Demartini & Paoloni, 2011).

2.2. Administration of HEI

Universities and their managers face increasing demands for improved efficiency and accountability (Stensaker, Frolich & Aamodt, 2018). These led to quality assurance measures for internationally relevant economic drivers (Song, 2018) and decreasing university autonomy (Eastman et al., 2018). Performance-based metrics have occurred, most particularly in research, such as Excellence in Research for Australia, Research Excellence Framework in Britain and elsewhere (Kwok, 2013). These metrics place importance on output quality and have an immediate impact on individual achievement in academics (Kwok, 2013; Kenny & Fluck, 2017). Although the academic work is disreputably difficult to quantify (Boyd, 2014), the justification for managing academic workload stems from the idea or concept of responsibility as one of the

'tenets of new management of the public (Bryson et al., 2014). Through performance management and workload allocation processes, the responsibility for institutional performance has been increasingly transferred onto individual academics (Franco-Santos, Rivera & Bourne, 2014; Kenny & Fluck, 2017). This underscores the need for effective and efficient processes to manage academic job and performance. Nevertheless, the resolution of these issues conveys deep political power that undertones in the institutions (Kenny, Fluck & Jetson, 2012; Kenny & Fluck, 2014; Kenny & Fluck, 2017).

2.3. *Instructions*

According to Huitt (2013) instruction is the process of learning activities in the class, which the teacher plans and manages. According to Joyce, et al. (2013), there are four categories of teaching or instructions models: processing of information, social interaction, personal development and behavioral systems. Each instruction model varies in the measurement or type of targeted learning.

Literature and studies show significant relations between the quality instructions and effective learning purposes in the tertiary level. Therefore, HEIs cannot compromise the need for hiring teachers with strong academic credentials, content knowledge, experiences and technical skills (Sogunro, 2017). The teaching strategies used by the teacher can have intense effects on student performance (Hattie, 2012; Liefoghe & Verbruggen, 2019).

2.4. *Research*

Institutions are focused on research activities by providing monetary and non-monetary support to the academic staff in order to motivate them to do research (Bernarte & Pambuena, 2017). With limited financial resources, some of the institutions encourage their faculty to look for external funding sources (Ali, et.al. 2010). In order to improve the quality of instruction and professional advancement of the teachers, involvement in research activities are encouraged (Walden & Bryan, 2010). Likewise, Hemmings and Kay (2010) suggest that academic staff support research in the academe. There is a big challenge in the HEIs producing quality research and publications (Gitlin & Lyons, 2004). Danchisko and Thomas (2012) suggest that LUCs support the academic staff in their research activities through different support services. However, Jung et al. (2019) reiterate that HEIs are providing limited resources and funding to

support institutional research making teachers less motivated to accomplish any research activities.

2.5. Extension

Extension programs and activities involve interacting and helping a community or group in an area to improve the quality of life (Rubio et al., 2016). According to Chua et al. (2014), community extension in the HEIs was designed for learners, teachers and staff to develop their involvement in the different social programs. These programs influence the values and characters of the learners and staff (Laguador & Chavez, 2013). In addition, it is mandated that schools and other education institutions have to be involved in the community undertaking according to Section 7 of the Republic Act 232 or Education Act of 1982. According to Ceniza (2015), HEIs must build an organization through the community that help and support all members of the community.

2.6. Local Government Unit Assistance

According to Anabe-Aducon (2019), LGUs are recognized sustainable structures for the routine of local functions that use public resources for the delivery of services. Hence, the grant of local fiscal autonomy is taken into account for the effective government system. In terms of the HEIs, municipalities in the Philippines run the LCUs and some universities. The LGUs provide funding for the infrastructures and facilities of the LCUs (Danao, 2010).

It emboldens the local government units countrywide to launch their own type of local institutions of learning. For the past decade, Philippines has observed an extensive development of colleges runs by the LGU nationwide. From 2003, there are 46 local college units, which increased to 101 public colleges in 2015 (CHED, 2016). Unluckily, the development of prospects in education took in higher education institutions is supplemented by a declining the value of education in the country (Durban & Catalan, 2012; Chua, 2011). The level of assistance provided by the LGUs in building partnerships and collaboration with HEIs is high. Most of the support provided by the LGUs to colleges is within the sort of financial assistance (Dela Cruz, 2014).

3. Methodology

This study used the descriptive-evaluative research design to describe and assess the current operational practices of PUP Laguna satellite campuses in terms of administration, instructions, research, extension and LGU assistance. These methods were used to unfold new explanation, and to describe only the best practices of the university.

The respondents of the study are 112 faculty members from the four (4) PUP Laguna Campuses namely PUP Biñan, PUP Calauan, PUP Sta. Rosa and PUP San Pedro during the second semester of the academic year 2019-2020. All the four campuses of Laguna were included since it has only 157 total faculty members. Most of the respondents came from Campus D with the total number of 37, followed by Campus C with the sample size of 28, Campus A with the sample size of 26, and Campus B with the sample size of 21. Stratified sampling technique was utilized in determining the respondents. Since the number of respondent is limited in the study, simple random sampling was used by picking the names of the faculty from the bowl using the draw lots in each campus. The questionnaire in Google Form was emailed to all the respondents using the directory given by the academic heads in each campus.

The study used a self-made questionnaire in 5-scale Likert style statements. The variable assessed pertain to the different aspects of the operations of an HEI. The data gathered were treated with necessary statistics such as weighted mean, Kruskal-Wallis H Test and Mann-Whitney U Test.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1 details the respondents' assessment of the operation of PUP Laguna satellite campuses in terms of administration. An overall mean of 4.2359 indicates that the faculty perceives the operation of the administration as "Very satisfactory". Faculty insight regarding the proper observance of working hours obtained a mean of 4.3571 or "Very satisfactory", and prompt service obtained a mean of 4.2768 or "very satisfactory". However, the administration's indicator regarding 'creates a climate of trust by open communication' garnered a mean value of 4.1875 or "very satisfactory" and the lowest mean of 4.1786 or "very satisfactory" is gives due recognition to excellent performance of the teachers, students, and staff.

Table 1*Respondents' Assessment of the Operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of Administration*

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Prompt Service	4.2768	Very Satisfactory
Clear Guidelines/Policies	4.1964	Very Satisfactory
Proper/Accurate Dissemination of information	4.1964	Very Satisfactory
Proper observance of working hours	4.3571	Very Satisfactory
Punctuality and regularity of attendance	4.2589	Very Satisfactory
Creates a climate of trust by open communication.	4.1875	Very Satisfactory
Gives due recognition to excellent performance of the teachers, students, and staff.	4.1786	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean:	4.2359	Very Satisfactory

Legend: "Poor (1.00 – 1.50)", "Fair (1.51 – 2.50)", "Satisfactory (2.51 – 3.50)", "Very Satisfactory (3.51 – 4.50)", "Outstanding (4.51 – 5.00)"

The results support the study of Collewet M. and Sauerman J. (2017), that the management and the working time policies effect the productivity of the firm. However, this reliant not only affect labor productivity on working hours at the individual level, but also on different factors such as availability of workers. On the other hand, Baskar (2013) posits that there will be an improved satisfaction and motivation in giving rewards and recognition to employees, and then there would be a resultant alteration in the satisfaction and motivation of their work. The motivation and satisfaction could lead to higher levels of productivity and performance. This is attested by Tanner (2015) that employees' work must be recognized and rewarded.

Table 2*Respondents' Assessment of the Operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of Instructions*

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Use the faculty manual as a guide in teaching.	4.1875	Very Satisfactory
Apply real life situation in the community to make learning relevant.	4.4018	Very Satisfactory
Utilizes the instructional materials (eg. Reading materials, chalk, eraser etc.)	4.4732	Very Satisfactory
Works overtime doing other things which is not included in the official time.	4.4196	Very Satisfactory
Apply collaborative learning in dealing with students.	4.4375	Very Satisfactory
Attends in seminar/training for professional growth.	4.3214	Very Satisfactory
Explains the topic in accordance to students' level.	4.4911	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean:	4.3903	Very Satisfactory

Legend: "Poor (1.00 – 1.50)", "Fair (1.51 – 2.50)", "Satisfactory (2.51 – 3.50)", "Very Satisfactory (3.51 – 4.50)", "Outstanding (4.51 – 5.00)"

Table 2 shows the respondents' assessment of the operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of Instructions. An overall mean of 4.3903 indicates that the faculty perceives the operation in terms of the instructions as "very satisfactory". The highest mean of 4.4911 rated as "very satisfactory" was given to the statement "explains the topic in line with to the level of the students". In addition, the indicator "attends in seminar/training for professional growth" with the mean of 4.3214 and use of the faculty manual as a guide in teaching garnered the lowest mean value of 4.1875 were also rated "very satisfactory".

As stated by Finley (2017) that instruction concerns the teaching and learning process, differentiated instructions are obviously applied by the teaching staff in PUP. This asserts the observation of Johnson (2018) on the time and effort requirement in the preparation of the teaching materials. It also assets the findings of Bridge (2018) on the use of learning guides in effective instructions.

Table 3

Respondents' Assessment of the Operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of Research

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Availability of Research Office	3.5804	Very Satisfactory
Availability of Research Coordinator	3.6518	Very Satisfactory
Availability of Computer unit for research works	3.4196	Satisfactory
Availability of Research manual.	3.5089	Satisfactory
Utilizes research output to promote sustainable development	3.7232	Very Satisfactory
Provides an opportunity for faculty and students to showcase their research outputs in seminars and trainings.	4.0179	Very Satisfactory
Encourage faculty to pursue externally-funded research.	4.0893	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean:	3.7130	Very Satisfactory

Legend: "Poor (1.00 – 1.50)", "Fair (1.51 – 2.50)", "Satisfactory (2.51 – 3.50)", "Very Satisfactory (3.51 – 4.50)", "Outstanding (4.51 – 5.00)"

Table 3 presents the assessment of the operation in terms of research, which garnered an overall mean of 3.7130 interpreted as "very satisfactory". The indicator affirming that PUP Laguna campuses encourage faculty to pursue externally-funded research were found "very satisfactory" with a highest mean value of 4.0893. Moreover, the indicator 'provides an opportunity for faculty and students to showcase their research outputs in seminars and training' were also found "very satisfactory" with the second highest mean value of 4.0179. Meanwhile,

two items were rated as “satisfactory”; availability of research manual with the mean value of 3.5089 and availability of computer unit for research work with the lowest mean of 3.4196.

In relation to external funding, Smith (2016) points on self-sufficiency and self-actualization as positive motivation in searching for external research funding. Similarly, Gallup & Svare (2016) believe that funding research is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Whereas faculty should get grants in order to do research, too often at the present time that the faculty do studies for them to have scholarship grants. In addition, support services such as computer can also equip teachers in research formulation. As Chamanlal (2014) and Singh (2016) assert that, the availability of computer is necessary nowadays for research works.

Table 4

Respondents' Assessment of the Operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of Extension

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Extension Programs are supported by the LGU	4.0357	Very Satisfactory
There is an allotment of budget from LGU	3.8571	Very Satisfactory
The Expertise of PUP is being utilized	4.2768	Very Satisfactory
The Extension Programs/Project has an impact to the community	4.2411	Very Satisfactory
The Extension Project helps people to improve their lives	4.1875	Very Satisfactory
Extension Programs are participated in by all teachers.	3.8482	Very Satisfactory
Provides continuing program for upgrading the capabilities of extension workers through trainings.	3.9196	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean:	4.0522	Very Satisfactory

Legend: “Poor (1.00 – 1.50)”, “Fair (1.51 – 2.50)”, “Satisfactory (2.51 – 3.50)”, “Very Satisfactory (3.51 – 4.50)”, “Outstanding (4.51 – 5.00)”

Table 4 shows that the overall respondents' assessment of the operation in terms of extension is 4.0522 interpreted as “very satisfactory”. It also affirms that the expertise of PUP is being utilized (4.2768) and the extension programs/project impacts the community (4.2411). With lowest means are allotment of budget from LGU (3.8571) and extension program participated in by all teachers (3.8471). All the statements were rated as “very satisfactory.”

Similar to the findings of Tapscott (2010) that community service is a factor in shaping the personality of a person, it is substantial to provide activities that could also impact or improve the community. Moreover, the extension program serves as an instrument for change (Rubio et al., 2016). In contrast with the study of Gonzales (n.d) on the common community service programs, the PUP focuses on the tutorial and literacy program because it serves as the

strength of the University teachers. In addition, involvement of the faculty depends on the type of extension programs of the department he/she belongs.

Table 5

Respondents' Assessment of the Operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of LGU Assistance

Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Budget allocation for other operating expenses.	3.8839	Very Satisfactory
LGU financial and moral support to campus activities	4.0268	Very Satisfactory
Financial support to students' activities	3.8304	Very Satisfactory
Tap resources and scholarship donors for the students as well as donations in equipment for instructional purposes.	3.9375	Very Satisfactory
Consultation/Coordination of LGU to PUP	4.0536	Very Satisfactory
LGU Offers career opportunities for graduates.	4.0446	Very Satisfactory
Provides and maintains the location of PUP (eg. Lot, lands and buildings)	3.9821	Very Satisfactory
Grand Mean:	3.9655	Very Satisfactory

Legend: "Poor (1.00 – 1.50)", "Fair (1.51 – 2.50)", "Satisfactory (2.51 – 3.50)", "Very Satisfactory (3.51 – 4.50)", "Outstanding (4.51 – 5.00)"

Table 5 details the respondents' assessment of the operation in terms of LGU assistance with an overall mean of 3.9655 rated as "very satisfactory". Consultation/coordination of LGU to PUP got the highest mean of 4.0536 followed by LGU offers career opportunities for graduates with the mean of 4.0446. The two lowest means were budget allocation for other operating expenses with 3.8839 and financial support to students' activities with 3.8304. All indicators were rated "very satisfactory."

Table 6 displays the agreement between respondents' assessment of the PUP in Laguna Campuses when grouped according to age using Kruskal-Wallis H Test.

Based on the results, the administration has an h-Value of 8.085 and a p-Value of 0.232; instructions has an h-Value of 4.325 and a p-Value of 0.633; research has an h-Value of 3.001 and a p-Value of 0.809; extension has an h-Value of 3.593 and a p-Value of 0.732; and LGU assistance has an h-Value of 1.899 with a p-Value of 0.929. Since all the p-values are greater than the level of significance, which is 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Therefore, the study concludes, *"there is no enough evidence to show that there is a significant agreement between the administration, instructions, research, extension and LGU assistance of the*

respondents' assessment when grouped according to age." In other words, respondents have the same assessment on the indicators of operation when grouped according to age.

Table 6

Kruskal-Wallis H Test between the Assessment Indicators and the Respondents' Age

Indicators	Age	Mean Rank	H- value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Administration	20-25 yrs.of age	45.36	8.085	0.232	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 yrs.of age	66				
	31-35 yrs.of age	66.46				
	36-40 yrs.of age	52.58				
	41-45 yrs.of age	54.87				
	46-50 yrs.of age	48.96				
	50 years of age and above	51.76				
Instructions	20-25 yrs. of age	66.07	4.325	0.633	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 yrs. of age	58.75				
	31-35 yrs. of age	55.31				
	36-40 yrs. of age	60.46				
	41-45 yrs. of age	49.83				
	46-50 yrs. of age	45.38				
	50 years of age and above	60.65				
Research	20-25 yrs. of age	52.86	3.001	0.809	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 yrs. of age	65.11				
	31-35 yrs. of age	60.06				
	36-40 yrs. of age	56.23				
	41-45 yrs. of age	53.7				
	46-50 yrs. of age	46.63				
	50 years and above	55.89				
Extension	20-25 yrs. of age	65.5	3.593	0.732	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 yrs. of age	65.5				
	31-35 yrs. of age	54.98				
	36-40 yrs. of age	60.12				
	41-45 yrs. of age	49.77				
	46-50 yrs. of age	49.67				
	50 years and above	55.89				
LGU Assistance	20-25 yrs. of age	62.43	1.899	0.929	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	26-30 yrs. of age	55.86				
	31-35 yrs. of age	62.56				
	36-40 yrs. of age	56.77				
	41-45 yrs. of age	53.83				
	46-50 yrs. of age	51.88				
	50 years and above	53.31				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Table 7*Mann-Whitney U Test between the Assessment Indicators and the Respondents' Sex*

Indicators	Sex	Mean Rank	U- value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Administration	Male	59.10	-1.405	0.160	Failed to	Not Significant
	Female	51.43			Reject Ho	
Instructions	Male	56.07	-0.222	0.824	Failed to	Not Significant
	Female	57.34			Reject Ho	
Research	Male	57.30	-0.393	0.694	Failed to	Not Significant
	Female	54.93			Reject Ho	
Extension	Male	56.72	-0.107	0.914	Failed to	Not Significant
	Female	56.08			Reject Ho	
LGU Assistance	Male	57.16	-0.320	0.749	Failed to	Not Significant
	Female	55.21			Reject Ho	

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Table 7 shows the agreement of respondents' assessment when grouped according to sex using Mann-Whitney U Test. The results showed that administration has an u-Value of -1.405 and a p-Value of 0.160, instructions has an u-Value of -0.222 and a p-Value of 0.824, research has an u-Value of -0.393 and a p-Value of 0.694, extension has an u-Value of -0.107 and a p-Value of 0.914, and LGU assistance has an u-Value of 0.320 and a p-Value of 0.749. Since all the indicators have p-values greater than the level of significance, which is 0.05, the null hypothesis is also not rejected. In other words, respondents whether male or female have similar assessment on the operation of Laguna Campuses.

Table 8 shows the test of agreement of respondents' assessment when grouped according to civil status using Kruskal-Wallis H-Test. The values calculated include: administration (h-Value 4.148; p-Value 0.246), instructions (h-Value 1.122; p-Value 0.772), research (h-Value 3.601; p-Value 0.308), extension (h-Value 2.049; p-Value 0.562), and LGU assistance (h-Value 3.454; p-Value 0.562). Since all the indicators have p-values greater than the level of significance of 0.05, the results failed to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, teachers have similar assessment of the PUP Laguna Campuses operation regardless of their civil status.

Table 8*Kruskal-Wallis H Test between the Assessment Indicators and the Respondents' Civil Status*

Indicators	Civil Status	Mean Rank	H- value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Administration	Single	60.03	4.148	0.246	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	54.84				
	Widowed	23.75				
	Separated	43.5				
Instructions	Single	55.36	1.122	0.772	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	56.9				
	Widowed	58.75				
	Separated	85.5				
Research	Single	59.31	3.601	0.308	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	53.58				
	Widowed	48.5				
	Separated	104				
Extension	Single	57.54	2.049	0.562	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	55.09				
	Widowed	52				
	Separated	96.5				
LGU Assistance	Single	59.65	3.454	0.327	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Married	53.81				
	Widowed	37.25				
	Separated	96				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Table 9 shows the Kruskal-Wallis H Test of the respondents' assessment grouped according to the highest educational attainment.

The calculated values include: administration (h-Value 1.572; p-Value 0.814), instructions (h-Value 7.978; p-Value 0.092), research (h-Value 5.583; p-Value 0.233), extension (h-Value 7.019; p-Value 0.135), and LGU assistance (h-Value 6.357; p-Value 0.173). All the indicators have p-values greater than the level of significance of 0.05 thus the null hypothesis is accepted. The educational attainment posits no significant difference in the assessment of the PUP operations.

Table 9*Kruskal-Wallis H Test between the Assessment Indicators and the Respondents' Highest Educational Attainment*

Indicators	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean Rank	H- value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Administration	Bachelor's Degree	51.69	1.572	0.814	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	with Master's units	59.16				
	Master's Degree	52.64				
	with Doctorate units	59.90				
	Doctorate Degree	56.63				
Instructions	Bachelor's Degree	41.75	7.978	0.092	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	with Master's units	59.47				
	Master's Degree	48.21				
	with Doctorate units	63.02				
	Doctorate Degree	65.44				
Research	Bachelor's Degree	36.94	5.583	0.233	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	with Master's units	55.27				
	Master's Degree	64.05				
	with Doctorate units	54.50				
	Doctorate Degree	56.09				
Extension	Bachelor's Degree	32.50	7.019	0.135	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	with Master's units	58.81				
	Master's Degree	56.36				
	with Doctorate units	63.79				
	Doctorate Degree	53.38				
LGU Assistance	Bachelor's Degree	30.44	6.357	0.174	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	with Master's units	59.23				
	Master's Degree	59.12				
	with Doctorate units	57.77				
	Doctorate Degree	56.94				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Table 10*Mann-Whitney U Test between the Assessment Indicators and the Respondents' Employment Status*

Indicators	Employment Status	Mean Rank	U- value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Administration	Part-time	58.47	-1.638	0.101	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Permanent	47.43				
Instructions	Part-time	54.27	-1.766	0.077	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Permanent	66.78				
Research	Part-time	57.03	-0.401	0.689	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Permanent	54.05				
Extension	Part-time	56.33	-0.129	0.898	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Permanent	57.28				
LGU Assistance	Part-time	55.22	-0.949	0.343	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	Permanent	62.38				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

Table 10 shows the Mann-Whitney U Test of the respondents' assessment grouped according to employment status. The results show that all the indicators have p-values higher than the 0.05 level of significance. The calculated p-values are 0.101 (administration), 0.077 (instructions), 0.689 (research), 0.898 (extension), and 0.343 (LGU assistance). In this case, the null hypothesis is accepted that the part-time and permanent faculty respondents have similar assessment on the operation of Laguna Campuses.

Table 11 the calculation of the significant difference in the respondents' assessment grouped according to years of service using Kruskal-Wallis H Test. All the indicators have p-values greater than the 0.05 level of significance. The calculated results are administration with p-Value of 0.541, instructions with p-Value of 0.279, research with p-Value of 0.643, extension with p-Value of 0.339, and LGU assistance with p-Value of 0.495. These results failed to reject the null hypothesis. This signifies that the selected faculty respondents of Laguna Campuses have similar assessment on the indicators of operation regardless of their years of service.

Table 11*Kruskal-Wallis H Test between the Assessment Indicators and the Respondents' Length of Service in PUP*

Indicators	Length of Service	Mean Rank	H- value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Administration	1-5 years	60.23	4.058	0.541	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10 years	57.65				
	11-15 years	44.5				
	16-20 years	43.5				
	21-25 years	43.5				
	Others	54				
Instructions	1-5 years	55.35	6.291	0.279	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10 years	52.8				
	11-15 years	60.81				
	16-20 years	85.5				
	21-25 years	85.5				
	Others	74.8				
Research	1-5 years	60.1	3.373	0.643	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10 years	54.12				
	11-15 years	59.69				
	16-20 years	71				
	21-25 years	26				
	Others	44				
Extension	1-5 years	64.49	5.677	0.339	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10 years	51				
	11-15 years	52.42				
	16-20 years	74.25				
	21-25 years	52				
	Others	53.1				
LGU Assistance	1-5 years	61.88	4.387	0.495	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
	6-10 years	52.98				
	11-15 years	53.69				
	16-20 years	76				
	21-25 years	18.5				
	Others	56.5				

Note: If p value is less than or equal to the level of significance which is 0.05 reject the null hypothesis otherwise failed to reject Ho.

5. Conclusion

The teaching staff assessment of the operation of PUP Laguna Satellite Campuses in terms of administration, instructions, research, extension, and LGU assistance are very satisfactory. When grouped according to the respondents' profile, there was no enough evidence

to show significant difference in the assessments of the teaching staff. Regardless of the respondents' age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, employment status and length of service, the assessment remains the same. Although the assessments results to very satisfactory, there is room for improvement to attain the 'outstanding' status.

In reference to the administration, giving due recognition in the excellent performance of the faculty, students, and staff, should be taken into consideration by giving cash gifts, tokens or incentives. The campus administrators may consider the public posting of appreciation to let the people know the achievement through tarpaulin or social media. Similarly, the achievement of the faculty, students, and staff from different campus or branch especially coming from the small campuses can be published in the university official website. Moreover, the faculty members should attend orientation on the different provisions of the faculty manual. To help teaching staff in research, providing computer units in the library or faculty lounge intended for research works be provided. On the LGU assistance, consider seeking funds for faculty development trainings and seminars or scholarships for professional enhancement, students' curricular and co-curricular activities and other operating expenses that would benefit the administrators, faculty, and students.

Further research can be conducted that will enliven the continuity and further development of the study on hand. Other researchers may works on topics that were not taken up in this study because of constraints, such as using other variables. Furthermore, similar study with larger number of population and wider locale can be considered.

References

- Ali, M., Bhattacharyya, P., & Olejniczak, A. (2015). The effects of scholarly productivity and institutional characteristics on the distribution of federal research grants. *Journal of Higher Education*, 81(2), 164–178
- Anabe-Aducon, R. (2019). Local Government Finance: It's Relationship to the Socio-Economic Development in the Municipalities of Northern Samar, Philippines . *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 36(1)
- Baskar, P., (2013). A Study on the Impact of Rewards and Recognition on Employee Motivation. *International Journal of Education Research* 4(11)
- Bernarte, R., & Pambuesa, E. (2017). The Research Skills, Personal Effectiveness, Networking and Team Working, and Communication Skills of Polytechnic University of the Philippines Laguna Campuses Faculty: Basis for an Action Plan. Retrieved from <https://knepublishing.com/index.php/KnE-Social/article/view/2391/5260#toc>

- Boyd, L. (2014) Exploring the utility of workload models in academe: a pilot study, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36:3, 315-326, DOI:10.1080/01587919.2014.899050
- Bryson, J.M., Crosby, B.C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4) 445-456. DOI: 10.1111/puar.12238
- Ceniza, Ma. Victoria R. (2005). Assessment of Community Extension Services of Accredited Institutions of Higher Learning in the Philippines: Basis for a Development Model. Retrieved from: http://local.lsu.edu.ph/institutional_research_office/publications/vol.13no.2/4.html
- Chamanlal, M., (2014). Role of Computer Applications and Tools in the Scientific Research Process. International Journal of Research in Science and Technology. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering* Volume 7 Issue 1
- Chua, V. D., Caringal, K. P., De Guzman, B. R. C., Baroja, E. A. D., Maguindayao, J. B., & Caiga, B.T. (2014). Level of Implementation of the Community Extension Activities of Lyceum International Maritime Academy. *Educational Research International*, 3(3), 19-28.
- Collewet M., & Sauerman J., (2017). Working Hours and Productivity. IZA Institute of Labor Economics. Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10722.pdf>
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED) (2016). List of higher education institutions Region VII. Retrieved on August 19, 2017 from <http://www.ched.gov.ph/chedwww/index.php/eng/Information/List-of-Higher-Education-Institutions-HEIs/REGION-VII>
- Danao, C, (2010). The medium-term higher education development plan and the local colleges and universities. Manila Bulletin
- Danchisko, K., & Thomas, A. (2012). Assessing faculty research productivity at public research institutions. Washington, DC: Education Advisory Board. Retrieved from <https://dc.etsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4401&context=etd>
- Dela Cruz, G. P.. (2014). Collaboration Between Administrators of National Secondary Schools and the Local Government Units (LGUs): Its Impact on the Schools' Development. *IAMURE International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 8(1).
- Demartini P., Paoloni P.,(2011). Assessing human capital in knowledge intensive business services, *Measuring Business Excellence*, vol. 15, Iss: 4 pp. 16 – 26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13683041111184071>
- Durban, J. M., & Catalan, R. D. (2012). Issues and concerns of Philippine education through the years. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 1 (2)

- Eastman, J., Jones, G.A., Begin-Caouette, O., Li, S.X., Noumi, C. And Trottier, C. (2018). Provincial oversight and university autonomy *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 48(3), 65-81.
- Epoc, F. J.. (2010). Tuition Fee Increment and Quality of Education of Selected Private Secondary Schools in Metro Manila. *Luz y Saber*, 2(1).
- Finley, T., (2017). *Teaching a Class with a Big Ability Differences*. George Lucas Educations Edutopia. . Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/article/teaching-class-big-ability-differences-todd-finley>
- Francis, A. (2016). *From the Agency Perspective*. Times Higher Education.
- Franco-Santos, M., Rivera, P. & Bourne, M. (2014). *Performance Management in UK Higher Education Institutions: The need for a hybrid approach*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Gallup, G., & Svare, B., (2016) *The undesirable consequences of the growing pressure on faculty to get grants* (essay) | Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved 6 June 2020, from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/07/25/undesirable-consequences-growing-pressure-faculty-get-grants-essay>
- Ghaicha, A. (2016). Theoretical Framework for Educational Assessment: A Synoptic Review. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol.7, No.24
- Gitlin, L. & Lyons, K. (2004). *Successful grant writing: Strategies for health and human service professionals* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer Publication Co.
- Gonzales, A., (N.D),. *Faculty Members Perceptions Towards Community Extension*. Retrieved from http://local.lsu.edu.ph/institutional_research_office/publications/vol.13no.2/4.html
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on achievement*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Heizer, Jay, and Barry Render. (2014) *Operations Management*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2010). Research self-efficacy, publication output, and early career development. *Internal Journal of Educational Management*, 24(7), 562-574.
- Huitt, W. (2003). *Classroom instruction. Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University.
- Johnson, A. (2018). *How to teach Students with Different Learning Abilities*. Retrieved from <https://study.com/blog/how-to-teach-students-with-different-learning-abilities.html>
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M., & Calhoun, E. (2003). *Models of teaching* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Jung, Y. L., Yoo, H. S., & Kim, E. S. (2019). *The relationship between government research funding and the cancer burden in South Korea: implications for prioritizing health research*.
- Kelton, W. (2019). Operations Management. Investopedia. Retrieved from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/o/operations-management.asp>
- Kenny, J. & Fluck, A. (2014). The effectiveness of academic workload models in an institution: a staff perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36(6), 585-602. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2014.957889.
- Kenny, J. & Fluck, A.E. (2017). Towards a methodology to determine standard time allocations for academic work. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39 (5) pp. 503-523. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2017.1354773
- Kenny, J., Fluck, A. & Jetson, T. (2012). Placing a value on academic work, *Australian Universities' Review*, 54 (2) pp. 50-60.
- Kwok, J.T. (2013). Impact of ERA research assessment on university behaviour and their staff. NTEU National Policy and Research Unit. Melbourne: National tertiary Education Union. ISBN 978-0-9806500-6-8.
- Laguador, J. M., Mandigma, L. B., & Agena, E. (2013). Community Extension Service In The Waste Management Practices Of Brgy. Wawa Residents In Batangas City. *Academic Research International*, 4(4), 141.
- Liefooghe, B., & Verbruggen, F. (2019). On the Assimilation of Instructions: Stimulus-response Associations are Implemented but not Stimulus-task Associations. *Journal of Cognition*, 2(1)
- Matcha & et. al., (2018). Education in the Philippines. World Education News and Reviews. Retrieved from <https://wenr.wes.org/2018/03/education-in-the-philippines>
- Quality Management (2020). Retrieved June 06, 2020, from <https://www.helsinki.fi/en/university/strategy-and-management/quality-management>
- Smith, Sharon D., "Factors that Motivate Faculty to Pursue External Funding at a 4-Year Public Institution of Higher Education" (2016). Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3011. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3011>
- Song, J. (2018) Strategic responses to teaching quality accountability: A case study of a regional university in China from a decoupling perspective. *Higher Education Policy*.
- Stensaker, B., Frolich, N. And Aamodt, P.O. (2018) Policy, perceptions, and practice: A study of educational leadership and their balancing of expectations and interests at micro-level. *Higher Education Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-018-0115-7>
- Suarez, M., et.al., (2018) *Higher Education Systems and Institutions, Philippines*. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-94-017-9553-1_507-1

- Tanner, O.C., (2015). *Four Recommendations for Employee Recognition and Appreciation. Close HR Connections*. Retrieved from <https://closehr.com/4-recommendations-for-employee-recognition-and-appreciation/>
- Tapscott, W. (2010). *Three problems with Community Service*. Retrieved from <http://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/JTHR-2017.1.06.pdf>
- Walden, P., & Bryan, V. (2010). Tenured and non-tenured college of education faculty motivators and barriers in grant writing: A public university in the south. *Journal of Research Administration*, 42(3), 85-98.